

**MINUTES
CITY OF ST. CHARLES, IL
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 2019 7:00 P.M.**

Members Present: Silkaitis, Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Vitek, Pietryla, Bessner, Lewis

Members Absent: Stellato, Turner

Others Present: Mayor Rogina, Mark Koenen; City Administrator, Rita Tungare; Director of Community & Economic Development, Russell Colby; Community Development Division Manager, Ellen Johnson; City Planner, Monica Hawk; Development Engineer, Rachel Hitzemann; Planner, Ciara Miller; Economic Development Planner, Mark LaChappell; Building & Code Enforcement Division Supervisor, Bob Vann; Building & Code Enforcement Manager

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was convened by Chair Payleitner at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALLED

Roll was called:

Present: Payleitner, Lemke, Bancroft, Pietryla, Vitek, Bessner

Absent: Stellato, Silkaitis, Lewis

3. OMNIBUS VOTE

*d. Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to approve a Façade Improvement Grant for 628 N. 2nd Ave.

*e. Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to approve a Façade Improvement Grant for 202 Cedar Ave.

Aldr. Bessner made a motion to approve omnibus items *4d and *4e on the Agenda. Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried 5-0.

4. COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

a. Presentation of a Concept Plan for the St. Charles Public Library.

Ms. Johnson presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Don McKay-Sheehan Nagle Hartray Architects-Chicago- gave a brief history of the library site and showed a PowerPoint presentation of 2 concept plans; which were included in the meeting packet. He noted the plans did address some concerns/improvements heard from the Plan Commission.

***Aldr. Lemke joined the Committee at 7:18pm.**

Aldr. Bessner asked how much of the Carnegie façade would be taken down or apart. Mr. McKay said nothing would be demolished; one exception being the octagon piece in the lower right hand corner. He noted that the library's plan is to vacate the building to allow that construction to happen all at one

time; minimize the interruption. He added that they are proposing to consolidate a lot of the seating area in the 2-story space, put a fireplace as an anchor point with seating all around to be a grand reading room. Aldr. Bessner asked about the mention of interaction with the school on 5th Ave. Mr. McKay said they considered something similar to Hickory Knolls but there were concerns from the Park Dist. and the Plan Commission with that location being right at the intersection of Illinois Ave.; a major ingress/egress of the site; they're working with the library but there's a possibility it might not happen at all. He said that the alternate site plan takes that area and incorporates it by taking some of the asphalt away to have more pedestrian friendly green environments on the interior of the site. We've lost some of the green space on the far end of the site but there's still a substantial piece devoted to a landscaped area on the south of the site.

Laura Berry-311 S. 3rd Ave.-said she's a frequent patron of the library and asked if a parking survey has ever been done to state that we need that much asphalt; she's never seen the need for parking. Mr. McKay said there's currently 190 spaces on site, the proposed plan shows 220, that will change a little with some of the more pedestrian friendly plans; he said we know what's required for the library but they're still determining what's required for St. Marks, because there are times where both have big events at the same time; which then overflows onto the adjacent residential streets. From both the library and St. Mark's point of view, during the course of a year, there are enough events to warrant the number of parking spaces being proposed; even if a lot of the times it looks as though the whole lot isn't being used. Parking is still subject to study, what we are focused on tonight with the revised plans is the reconsideration and prioritization of the pedestrian environment. Ms. Berry noted that St. Mark's mostly uses it Saturday evenings and Sunday morning when the library is closed.

Aldr. Lemke said he agreed with the excess parking and worried that the library patrons and those in the taxing district will end up footing the bill for events at the church.

Aldr. Pietryla said he thinks it looks great and he likes the pedestrian friendly approach.

Chair Payleitner said she attended the Plan Commission meeting and she appreciates the applicant taking into consideration all the pedestrian concerns heard there.

Aldr. Lemke asked for timing. Mr. McKay said the plan is to start construction next spring, the library is now working with the school dist. to use one of their buildings for a temporary unit; we anticipate 14-15 months for completion.

b. Presentation of a Concept Plan for Riverview Townhomes, 504 S. 3rd Ave.

Ms. Johnson presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

John Green-Engineering Resource Assoc.-3S701 West Ave., Warrenville-gave a brief overview of the details of the proposed plan, Plan Commission comments, resident feedback and some additional things they are planning to add for this PUD; as well as some of the PUD requirements and variations they are seeking. He noted that they were challenged by the Plan Commission to construct this design but fit within the 32 ft. maximum building height rule, which they could do, but are not inclined to do so because it would be a flat roof, which is not consistent nor appreciative of the surrounding structures or transitions. He noted a similar project in Geneva on the east side of Rt. 31 and Stevens St.

Aldr. Pietryla referenced a comment in the packet materials that states that the city typically refrains from granting uses not permitted in the underlying zoning dist., as well as avoiding single lot PUD's; he wondered what the rationale is for that policy. Ms. Johnson stated that purpose of a PUD is for a

larger scale planned development, so in looking at a single lot the question is whether a PUD is warranted or if it's just being used as a means to grant zoning deviations; which is where that comment is coming from.

Donna Hutcheon-503 S. 4th Ave.-noted that there can be a lot of traffic at off of Prairie at South and 3rd, there's no light there, and a lot of the older homes have narrow driveways so they park on the street all the time, aside from any guests they may have; so there's only 1 drive lane, you have to pull over to be sure it's clear before going through. She likes the current small amount of parkway trees and grass, and she's opposed to the developer removing those to accommodate the development. She said there are already traffic issues there and adding to the density will make it worse; it's already a non-conforming use and she thinks that kind of density is out of character for the neighborhood, and she feels it's a bad idea, it doesn't add to the community in anyway and she encourages Committee to not approve it.

Laura Barry-311 S. 3rd Ave.- agreed with Ms. Hutcheon as to the traffic, density, character of the neighborhood and parkway greenery.

Bob Manthei-606 Riverside-stated that he owns the building to the south. He asked if there's a part of 3rd Ave. that was being shut down to be a park, and how that would tie into the proposed property. He also stated that parking is an issue; his building is filled up during the day, he hopes not to have any more cars coming his way. Seems like a tight spot; it's also a lot of building into a small space. Ms. Tungare said there's nothing staff is aware in regard to a park on 3rd Ave.

Chair Payleitner thanked Ms. Johnson for the well detailed resources in the packet materials explaining what's involved and addressing the topics for Committee to weigh in on tonight; which include:

- Change in land use
- Site layout and access
- Building architecture
- Whether a PUD is appropriate

Aldr. Bessner asked if we've allowed a PUD in the past, for a small property. Ms. Tungare said it has been done, but the primary purpose for a PUD is to demonstrate a strong public purpose and a strong community benefit. Aldr. Bessner asked if there's an opportunity to look at any of these variations without having to create a PUD. Ms. Tungare said a PUD would be the only route to look at all of the variation comprehensively; our Zoning Board of Appeals can only grant a limited number of variations through our city code; so it would have to be a PUD for all the variations being requested.

Aldr. Pietryla said his comments reflect all of what the residents had to say, as well as the Plan Commission, particularly with the community benefit being a filter used to determine a PUD, and not to be solely used as a means to be used to obtain zoning variances. He did note that it's great architecture though.

Aldr. Vitek did not have a comment on the PUD, but did ask for clarification as to whether the current home is a single family home being used as a 2 family unit; which would now be a 3 family unit. Chair Payleitner said correct.

Aldr. Bessner said whether the PUD is appropriate or not, it gives better control over the development to the approving authority; he personally likes having that kind of agreement in place, he's not sure

why it would be used the other way to say it's not appropriate. He likes the architecture, but it is a tight site and this will become very prominent; it's tough; and there's also nothing like it in the neighborhood.

Aldr. Turner said it's okay with him.

Aldr. Lemke said his concern is that every time there's a corner lot that would take 2-3 more units than a non-conforming 2-unit where it's been converted to 2, doesn't make it automatically good for a 3 unit; he sees it being a problem throughout that neighborhood, if we allow this, everyone will ask for a PUD to do so. He was curious as to how the Plan Commission felt, and if there are enough of them that could push this for a positive recommendation. Ms. Johnson said she really couldn't really say if there were a majority in favor or opposed, she thinks the majority expressed at least some concern and wanted more information; Plan Commission minutes and transcripts should be available soon to get a better idea of that. Aldr. Lemke also noted he has a concern about the parking, and making a right turn at the corner by the old doctor's office; but if we're willing to let go of parkways everywhere, then maybe this is the place to start.

Chair Payleitner asked what the next steps are. Ms. Johnson said the concept plan process concludes this evening, if the applicant wishes to move forward they would submit zoning applications with engineering plans.

Aldr. Pietryla asked Plan Commission member-Tom Pretz-to address what he thinks his colleagues are thinking. Mr. Pretz said it's probably split as far as the PUD; the feelings were mixed.

Chair Payleitner added that she feels it's a beautiful but she's not sure it's appropriate or that it calls for a PUD; that's where she kind of takes a step back.

Aldr. Turner asked if this is in the historic district, and noted that there are a lot of rental properties there, and this is the second time in this area where they take a rental property and put more of a modern building up. Ms. Johnson added that the one across from the parking garage was in the historic district; this one is not. Aldr. Turner said this is kind of becoming a trend though in that area, so that whole area will transform away from traditional homes over time. He noted that down 5th Ave. there's been a lot of remodeling/restructuring, including complete tear-downs, and he thinks it's the future, and he really believes in property rights, this won't be a 1 shot deal because there's a lot of rental properties in this area. Aldr. Bancroft added that when it does change developers are going to want that density.

- c. Historic Preservation Commission recommendation to approve Historic Landmark Designation for 218 Park Ave. (Almon Benedict Home).

Ms. Hitzemann presented the Executive Summary posted in the meeting packet.

Aldr. Turner made a motion to approve Historic Landmark Designation for 218 Park Ave. Seconded by Aldr. Bancroft. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion carried 6-0.

5. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS - None

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION - None

7. **ADDITIONAL ITEMS FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, STAFF OR CITIZENS-None.**
8. **ADJOURNMENT - Aldr. Bessner made a motion to adjourn at 8:04pm. Seconded by Aldr. Pietryla. Approved unanimously by voice vote. Motion Carried.**